

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO*

EXCERPTS FROM OUR STATE MEDICAL JOURNAL

Vol. VIII, No. 8, August, 1910

From Some Editorial Notes:

The Value of Drugs.—Healing cults rise, one after another, some to attain vogue for a little space and to die, some to make a more enduring impression. That they arise, and that some of them endure, is testimony that they meet some need of modern life. Healing cults, proprietary remedies, patent medicines. . . .

There is no more curious fact to be noted in medicine than that during the very period of cult expansion and expansion of proprietary and patent remedies, the therapeutic nihilist has arisen and waxed mightily in the profession. He has gained so much influence that a large proportion of our younger men consider it quite the thing to disavow a belief in the efficacy of drugs. . . .

The Wassermann Test for Syphilis in Practice.—It is generally conceded that the discovery of Wassermann's test for syphilis denotes immense progress in our knowledge of that disease; but as experience accumulates, misgivings arise in regard to the extent to which we may trust the verdicts of the test in practice. . . .

It seems a well-warranted conclusion that the Wassermann reaction, if properly carried out, is of great service in practice. . . .

The St. Louis Meeting of the American Medical Association.—It may not be malapropos, even at this time, to express the hope that a suitable hall or auditorium shall be available when the American Medical Association meets next year in Los Angeles. Many of the men who have the best things to say do not show custom in speaking in public rooms of large size, and either speak too low even for those with sharp ears, or else address their remarks to the chairman alone. A proper lectern should be provided, situated at the best point for easy speaking to the audience, so that all may hear, and those who discuss the papers should be in the same or an equally well-situated place. It seems a pity, too, that telephone messages for members in the audience should have to be constantly announced on the stage, but if it is a positive necessity, it should be arranged for so that the announcement may be made with the least annoyance of those who are listening to the papers or discussions. . . .

Empiricism Versus Rationalism in Surgery.—The average man is sometimes a trifle disinclined to think for himself. He has a good memory and readily learns, parrot-like, the technique of operations. He thinks of operations by the names of the men who described them, rather than by the principles involved and their relative advantages and disadvantages, and proceeds to perform these operations as set *procedures*. . . .

Just as it is better and more rational in prescribing to compile a prescription to suit the case, based on the action of the individual drugs, than to rely on the mysterious healing effect of some worshiped prescription, so in surgery it is better to learn the principles and processes in the repair of tissues and the effects of different procedures on the physiology, pathology, and repair. . . .

* This column strives to mirror the work and aims of colleagues who bore the brunt of Association work some twenty-five years ago. It is hoped that such presentation will be of interest to both old and new members.

(Continued in Front Advertising Section, Page 14)

BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA*

By CHARLES B. PINKHAM, M.D.
Secretary-Treasurer

News Items

One hundred and forty-eight applicants wrote the examination at the regular meeting of the Board of Medical Examiners held in San Francisco, July 8 to 11, inclusive.

The Board made the following changes in the status of licentiates:

Robert V. Baker, M. D., revoked October 16, 1934, was restored July 8, 1935, and placed on probation for a period of five years, without narcotic privileges.

John V. Cocke, M. D., revoked July 10, 1935, based upon record of narcotic conviction.

George Wellington Frasier, M. D., charged with narcotic derelictions, was on July 9, 1935, placed on probation for a period of five years, without narcotic privileges.

Robert S. Friend, M. D., revoked October 19, 1935, was on July 10, 1935, restored and placed on probation for five years, without narcotic privileges.

James A. Hadley, M. D., revoked October 19, 1933, was on July 8, 1935, restored and placed on probation for five years, without narcotic privileges.

Arthur W. Hewitt, M. D., was on July 9, 1935, found guilty of narcotic dereliction and placed on probation for three years, without narcotic privileges.

William J. Jacobs, M. D., was revoked July 9, 1935, based on the record of his conviction of murder and incarceration in San Quentin penitentiary.

Ramon Lopez, M. D., was on July 10, 1935, revoked, based on the record of his narcotic addiction.

Sam Lustberg, M. D., was on July 9, 1935, revoked, based on the record of his conviction in New Jersey of an asserted conspiracy to defraud an insurance company.

Shuah M. Mann, M. D., was on July 10, 1935, placed on probation for a period of three years, based upon his reported conviction of asserted bribery of a public official.

Frances E. McNealy, M. D., was on July 10, 1935, revoked, based on charges of narcotic addiction.

Byron H. Pelton, M. D., was revoked July 9, 1935, based on record of his conviction of narcotic dereliction.

Charles M. Stewart, M. D., revoked March 1, 1933, was on July 8, 1935, restored and placed on probation for a period of five years, without narcotic privileges.

On July 3, 1935, Attorney-General U. S. Webb rendered to the Board of Chiropractic Examiners Opinion 9917 to the effect that "the Chiropractic Act did not require an applicant for examination to possess a degree of 'Doctor of Chiropractic' and that an applicant who did not possess such a degree had a right to apply for examination for a license to practice chiropractic." In Opinion No. 10062, rendered by Attorney-General Webb to the Board of Medical Examiners, it was held that "a person who was graduated from an incorporated school that did not confer a degree would not be permitted to use the prefix 'Dr.' even though such person were granted a license to practice chiropractic." In this same opinion the Attorney-General held it was not necessary under Section 15 of the Chiropractic Initiative Act to use "any expression following the licensee's name. If, however, a designation follows

* The office addresses of the California State Board of Medical Examiners are printed in the roster of advertising page 6.

(Continued in Front Advertising Section, Page 15)